

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 2, 6-9, 13-15, and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,212,643 to Yoshida ("Yoshida") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,927 to Nakayama et al. ("Nakayama"); and rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Nakayama, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,014 to Koyanagi et al. ("Koyanagi").

Applicants amend claims 2 and 9. Claims 2, 6-9, and 13-23 remain pending and under examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2 and 9<sup>1</sup> under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserts that the specification does not support the claimed cursor indicating a scroll center . . . "irrespective of a location of the electronic map apparatus." Office Action at 2-3. Applicants amend claims 2 and 9 to obviate the rejection. Support for the amendment may be in found in Applicants' specification at, for example, page 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 9 under § 112.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 2, 6-9, and 13-23 under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established at least because the differences between the prior art and Applicants' claims are such that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prior art to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Office Action indicates claims 1 and 9 are rejected under § 112, claim 1 has been cancelled. Applicants assume the § 112 rejection covers claims 2 and 9.

Independent claim 2 recites an electronic map apparatus comprising a microcomputer that “displays a cursor indicating a scroll center in close proximity to a common center of the map, the scroll center providing a reference point for an object of operation during scrolling of the map in a vehicle” (emphases added). None of Yoshida, Nakayama, and Koyanagi, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the claimed microcomputer.

Yoshida discloses switch patterns 16-19 that are used for scrolling “maps to be displayed.” Yoshida, 3:67-4:11. Yoshida’s reference numeral 12 “denotes a current position indicating mark showing the current position of the vehicle.” Yoshida, 3:55-66; Fig. 3. However, as a user scrolls Yoshida’s screen, the reference numeral 12 tracks the location of the vehicle, making it off center and failing to provide “a reference point for an object of operation during scrolling” that is “in close proximity to a common center of the map,” as recited by claim 2.

Nakayama fails to cure Yoshida’s deficiencies. Nakayama’s cursor indicates a “present position,” not a “scroll center in close proximity to a common center of the map, the scroll center providing a reference point for an object of operation during scrolling of the map in a vehicle,” as recited by claim 2. Nakayama, Figs. 8, 17A; 14:47-60; 19:49-56.

Koyanagi fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoshida and Nakayama. Koyanagi uses a “triangular mark in the screen [that] represents the current position of the vehicle” and displays “the grid lines . . . at fixed display positions [so] the grid lines need not be rewritten even when the road map on the screen is scrolled.” Koyanagi, 5:11-15; 10:52-57. Koyanagi does not teach or suggest “scroll center in close proximity to a

common center of the map, the scroll center providing a reference point for an object of operation during scrolling of the map in a vehicle,” as recited by claim 2.

Accordingly, none of Yoshida, Nakayama, and Koyanagi, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the combination recited by claim 2. Independent claim 9, although of different scope than claim 2, patentably distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Claims 6-8 and 13-23 depend from independent claims 2 or 9 and therefore also patentably distinguish from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 2 and 9.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing the application in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the entry of this Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests the entry of this Amendment and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 14, 2009

By: 

Nathan A. Sloan  
Reg. No. 56,249  
(404) 653-6464